

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/608,320	06/27/2003	Lih-Jyh Weng	3123-554/MAX-017AUS	7998	
75	90 08/15/2006		EXAMINER		
Patricia A. Sheehan			CHAUDRY, MUJTABA M		
Cesari and McK	lenna, LLP			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
88 Black Falcor	Ave.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Boston, MA 0	Boston, MA 02210			2133	
			DATE MAILED: 08/15/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del></del>
Advisory Action	10/608,320	WENG ET AL.  Art Unit	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner		
	Mujtaba K. Chaudry	2133	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	ss
THE REPLY FILED 31 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date by The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP</li> </ol>	owing replies: (1) an amendment, af otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in once with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply more of the final rejection.  Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	fidavit, or other evidence compliance with 37 CFF ust be filed within one of in the final rejection, which g date of the final rejection	e, which t 41.31; or (3) f the following never is later. In
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of e under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	e on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. xtension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origer than three months after the mailing day).	of the fee. The appropriate in the final Office ate of the final rejection, even	e extension fee action; or (2) as en if timely filed,
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of the	of the date of appeal. Since
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
<ul> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection.</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further or</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE bel</li> </ul>	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	etter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying the	e issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))		jected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment (P	TOL-324).

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the

7. Moreover For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) 🔲 will not be entered, or b) 🛛 will be entered and an explanation of

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered

9. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and

entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a

Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

13. Other:

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

non-allowable claim(s).

Claim(s) rejected: 1-3 and 5-27.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

See Continuation Sheet.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_

Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants contend, "...Fuoco (prior art of record) does not teach or suggest that check bits are stored in one or more buffer locations in the buffer memory following the buffer locations that contain data..." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Fuoco teaches (Figure 1a and col. 3, lines 46-52, for example) a memory subsystem 22 which comprises a plurality of DRAMs 26 with associated ECC logic 28. The Examiner would like to point out that the memory stores the data (in the Dram) followed by the check bits in the ECC logic 28 as stated in the present application. The Examiner disagrees with Applicatants' remarks (page 12, paragraph 2), "...Fuoco clearly states that the data word and the associated check bits are stored in the same memory location..." As this statement is not supported in the reference. Infact, as the Examiner as pointed out in Figure 1a the check bits and the data are stored in the same manner as stated in the claims of the present application. Furthermore, each memory location can store 1 bit, therefore it is impossible to store two bits in one memory location. Applicants also contend, "Fuoco does not teach, "...a result that is usable to directly identify the buffer location of a data word that contains erroneous bit..." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Fuoco teaches (abstract, for example), "...to generate parity bits associated with each of the bytes of data...and regenerate parity bits and compare them with the original to detect error..." It is the Examiner's conclusion that the claims, as presented, are not patentably distinct or non-obvious over the prior art.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100